



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,088	10/04/2005	Jong-Soo Yoon	21C-0274	4167
23413 7590 10/08/2008 CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 20 Church Street 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103				
EXAMINER DUONG, TAI V				
ART UNIT 2871		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/08/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/552,088

**Applicant(s)**

YOON ET AL.

**Examiner**

TAI DUONG

**Art Unit**

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/04/05  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I (claims 1-10) in the reply filed on 07/03/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 11-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 07/03/2008.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuzawa et al (US 6,249,328) cited by Applicant in view of Jang et al (US 2003/0112388).

Fukuzawa et al disclose in Figs. 3 and 4 a LCD apparatus comprising an LCD panel assembly having a plurality of pixels controlling an arrangement of liquid crystal so as to display a color image; a light supplying unit having a light source (25-27) supplying a red light during a time corresponding to one-third of a frame, a green light during the time and a blue light during the time; each of the red light supplying unit, the green light supplying unit and the blue light supplying unit comprises a cold cathode fluorescent lamp or a light emitting diode (col.1, line 49 –col. 2, line 8; col. 3, line 57–col. 4, line 33). Thus, the only differences between the LCD apparatus of Fukuzawa and that of the instant claims are a light reflective-transmissive unit disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly so as to transmit the red light, the green

light and the blue light and to reflect a light externally provided to the LCD panel assembly in order to improve luminance of the color image; and the light reflective-transmissive unit comprising a light reflective-transmissive film including a plurality of first layers and a plurality of second layers, the first and second layers having different refractive indexes from each other, and the first and second layers being alternately stacked. However, Jang et al disclose in Figs. 4 and 5 a light reflective-transmissive unit 160 disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly; and the light reflective-transmissive unit 160 including a plurality of first layers and a plurality of second layers, the first and second layers having different refractive indexes from each other, and the first and second layers being alternately stacked (paragraphs 0044-0064). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ in the LCD apparatus of Fukuzawa the above-mentioned light reflective-transmissive unit disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly for enhancing the transmissivity and light efficiency of the LCD apparatus, as disclosed by Jang et al (abstract).

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon (US 6,480,247) cited by Applicant in view of Jang et al (US 2003/0112388).

Moon discloses in Figs. 5-9B and 14-16 a LCD apparatus comprising an LCD panel assembly having a plurality of pixels controlling an arrangement of liquid crystal so as to display a color image; a light supplying unit having a light source supplying a red light during a time corresponding to one-third of a frame, a green light during the

time and a blue light during the time; and a light guide plate including a light-exiting surface facing the light supplying unit, a light reflecting surface facing the light-exiting surface and a side surface connecting the light reflecting surface to the light-exiting surface, and wherein the light source is disposed on the side surface of the light guide plate (col. 2, line 21 - col. 3, line 12; col. 4, lines 14-57; col. 5, line 41 - col. 6, line 34). Thus, the only differences between the LCD apparatus of Moon and that of the instant claims are a light reflective-transmissive unit disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly so as to transmit the red light, the green light and the blue light and to reflect a light externally provided to the LCD panel assembly in order to improve luminance of the color image; and the light reflective-transmissive unit comprising a light reflective-transmissive film including a plurality of first layers and a plurality of second layers, the first and second layers having different refractive indexes from each other, and the first and second layers being alternately stacked. However, Jang et al disclose in Figs. 4 and 5 a light reflective-transmissive unit 160 disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly; and the light reflective-transmissive unit 160 including a plurality of first layers and a plurality of second layers, the first and second layers having different refractive indexes from each other, and the first and second layers being alternately stacked (paragraphs 0044-0064). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ in the LCD apparatus of Moon the above- mentioned light reflective-transmissive unit disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly for enhancing the

transmissivity and light efficiency of the LCD apparatus, as disclosed by Jang et al (abstract).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuzawa et al and Jang et al as applied to claims 1-5, 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Miyamae et al (US 2002/0093743) cited by Applicant.

The only difference between the LCD apparatus cited in the above rejection of claim 3 and that of the instant claim is the red light supplying unit, the green light supplying unit and the blue light supplying unit being alternately disposed. However, Miyamae et al disclose in Fig. 1 that it was known to employ the red light supplying unit, the green light supplying unit and the blue light supplying unit being alternately disposed (paragraphs 0046-0056 and 0071-0087). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Miyamae to employ in the LCD apparatus cited in the above rejection of claim 3 the red light supplying unit, the green light supplying unit and the blue light supplying unit being alternately disposed for obtaining a LCD apparatus with high brightness and uniform color.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon and Jang et al as applied to claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 above, and further in view of Miyamae et al (US 2002/0093743) cited by Applicant.

Claim 6 would have been obvious over Miyamae et al for the same reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 6 over Fukuzawa et al and Jang et al.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuzawa et al and Jang et al as applied to claims 1-5, 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Tsuda et al (US 7,106,400).

The only difference between the LCD apparatus cited in the above rejection of claim 1 and that of the instant claim is the pixels comprising a transparent electrode transmitting the red light, the green light and the blue light; and a reflective electrode disposed on the transparent electrode, the reflective electrode having a contact hole through which a portion of the transparent electrode is exposed. However, Tsuda et al disclose in Figs. 15 and 16 the pixels comprising a transparent electrode 37; and a reflective electrode 10 disposed on the transparent electrode, the reflective electrode having a contact hole (30, 31) through which a portion of the transparent electrode is exposed (col. 17, line 62 – col. 18, line 34). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of Tsuda to employ in the LCD apparatus cited in the above rejection of claim 1 the pixels comprising a transparent electrode transmitting the red light, the green light and the blue light; and a reflective electrode disposed on the transparent electrode, the reflective electrode having a contact hole through which a portion of the transparent electrode is exposed for obtaining a LCD apparatus with small power consumption and high contrast, due to the transfective type display.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon and Jang et al as applied to claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 above, and further in view of Tsuda et al (US 7,106,400).

Claim 9 would have been obvious over Tsuda et al for the same reasons set forth in the above rejection of claim 6 over Fukuzawa et al and Jang et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (571) 272-2291.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

TVD  
09/08

/Dung Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2871